Exhibit 11

(Exhibit 11 is a video of Academic Freedom Solutions conference filed and served separately)

Exhibit 11a

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	UT vs. LOWERY
11	ACADEMIC FREEDOM SOLUTIONS
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

(Recording begins.)

MODERATOR: As John Cochrane, this morning in his opening remarks said, this conference is not just focusing on trying to understand and analyze the state of academic freedom, but also to think about, sort of, practical and actionable solutions on how to protect or how to, like, gain back some academic freedom in our universities. So this is the focus of this panel, to think about some -- some actionable solutions.

And we'll go in the following order in terms of opening remarks. Richard will go first, setting sort of the stage a little bit, sharing some of his experiences. Dorian will go next, talking about the rules of engagement. Peter then will speak about how to engage the other side when necessary, and John will focus on how to enforce.

So Richard, please get started.

MR. LOWERY: So I apologize. Slight change of plans. Since we switched to live streaming, I had -- I know a lot about public universities, I know a lot about efforts to reform public universities, but I can't talk about that. And I can't talk about why I can't talk about that. So you can do whatever inferences you want there or we can have private conversations, but in the course of working on that issue, I've sort of thought a lot about the distinction between private universities and public universities and where maybe

private univer- -- how private universities could or could not get back to being something socially useful.

So I think it might be safe for me to make some comments about private universities, it might not. We'll probably find out. So here goes. So private universities, I think there are three things that need to be understood.

Again, I'm taking Cochrane -- John's idea, like, there's a problem, we need to fix it. I'm not going to really go start with that, but what do we need to understand about private universities to figure out how to fix them.

And I think there are three things that are worth focusing on, and I'm an economist and I'm actually a financial economist, so this is kind of informed by that.

Three things we need to understand, our governance, capital structure and what the product really is. What's the product market we're talking about? So governance in private universities is really strange.

So who runs a private university? Some board. Who's on that board? A bunch of -- and I'm going to focus on elite-type private universities, because that's all anyone cares about really. So the boards, they're a bunch of people who don't know anything about universities. They're the only ones who have any actual authority to change anything if they wanted to. What do they mostly do? I think they're mostly, you know, high-power business types. I think that's right.

And, you know, what are their incentives to -- to change things at universities?

Well, they have to do a lot of this kind of woke virtue signaling. They can either do that at their firms where it costs them money, or they can do it at the university where it doesn't cost them anything and they can just make other peoples' lives miserable. So what's the chances that they're -- that your board is actually going to step up and do anything? It's basically zero, and there's huge, you know, problems -- you know, faculty have a lot of independence, so they would need to really ride hard. That's not going to work.

The capital structure, that means, like, financial positioning, you know, how do the universities fund themselves, you know, what happens to a firm if it's just awful? It loses money and it goes out of business. We don't see a lot of firms that pile up billions and billions of dollars more of resources that they don't need just so they can hang around if they start to be terrible.

That's exactly what a university capital structure looks like. No matter how awful these places get, they still have tens of billions of extra dollars that they don't need to make sure they don't go away. So the capital structure is insane. You would never structure a firm with this many agency problems, this mu- -- much difficulty in managing that way. They need to be subject to some sort of

bankruptcy. We're not there. We don't have a capital structure that could bring about reform. So that's, you know, two strikes already.

So what could we do -- and I think -- thinking about what we could do, you have to think about what this product is. What are elite universities doing? What is Stanford doing? And as far as I can tell, they're sort of providing a coordination device where they designate certain people as in charge of things. You go to Harvard, you go to Stanford, you -- people have to listen to you and do what -- what you say.

This used to be a process where there was some filtering and you would hire -- you know, they -- they would check and see who's good and then maybe give you some training, but that's not true anymore. The -- the selection -- maybe it's still an IQ a little bit, but the selection of people and the way they're trained is awful. And if you look at some of the things that come out of -- you know, there's an example that I'd love to go into, but I better not.

But some of the, sort of, attitudes of people who raise to the top at elite universities, you -- you could never get there if you had a sensible, like, free environment. People would be told, no, that's a terrible thing to think, how dare you think that. Instead, these people rise to the top and they get put in charge of important things.

1 So what the university is selling is prestige. 2 And by "prestige," I mean, you know, a designation that you're 3 the person who gets listened to in the future. So a quick aside, you might think universities 5 create science, and that's an actual valuable product, but if you think -- if you really think about the capital structure as 7 a sort of science project, money goes in, ideas come out, that's great. But what is the university doing in that process? Mostly, they're just taxing it. You know, federal grants come in, and the university lets the scientists have 10 11 half of that and uses the other half for things. 12 So if we just move the science completely off, 13 that would be better. And it's not like we're getting a great environment for science at universities. We already had that 14 15 panel, like, this is the worst place to do it. Go find a new spot, get the federal grants and do it somewhere else and 16 17 that's clearly better. So that -- I don't think that's for the 18 product. All we're selling is this random designation. 19 So what do we do? We can't -- you know, we have 20 no capital structure approach. We -- we -- they're not going to go bankrupt. The boards are useless, they won't fix 21 22 anything. How do we do anything productive here? Well, you 23 know -- sorry, I should say -- and they're really -- like, the 24 university, they're really not -- like, the moment the universities needed to stand up, there's, like, discourse and

argument and all of that. In the pandemic, I'd say they -they completely reversed, like, they'd just crack down on any,
like, independent thought and just went straight to enforcing
some Zyte guy's orthodoxy. So we really need to do something
about that.

So I think there is a solution and I think the solution is something along the lines of tobacco company treatment. So how do we get -- you know, what happened to the tobacco companies? People turned on them. They were doing things that people didn't like, and, you know, it used to be it would be great to go work from Philip Morris. Now it would be embarrassing.

So we could do that. If we really put a lot of effort into showing what actually goes on in universities, we could get the brand to look like Philip Morris. And now Philip Morris is fine because they're selling something that's actually enjoyable. I mean, it's not great but there's a reason people like nicotine.

Universities are only selling their reputation. So if people really -- like, if all we did was put all our effort into showing people what's really happening here, eventually, that would kind of go away and they wouldn't be in charge of who's running things anymore, and we could come up with something else. I don't know what that looks like, but it's not going to be worse. So that's, I think, the only

1 practical solution I can come up with for private universities. 2 MODERATOR: Thank you. 3 MR. ABBOT: Okay. Well, I'm going to -- I'm going to talk about some sort of in the trenches, kind of, solutions that maybe could be useful. So first, I want to go 6 through -- I want to talk about what the objective should be, 7 what the strengths our side has and formulate some plans. So I agree with Jerry, Jerry Coyne, what he said this morning, that the objective should be Chicago principle, Kalven Report and 10 Shils report. 11 So Chicago principles say free expression on 12 campus, even if it offends someone, and put in place 13 punishments for disrupting other people's speech. Kalven 14 Report says the institution can never take a official corporate 15 position on any social and political issue at the risk of -- of 16 suppressing the speech of some members of the institution who 17 disagree. And the Shils re- -- report says that academic 18 appointments can only be made on the basis of academic 19 qualifications and nothing else. And the Shils report is 20 actually what's keeping DI statements out of University of Chicago hiring. So it has really important inf- -- and 21 immediate implications. 22 23 Okay. And the other thing is enforcement. 24 you can't just have these principles and say, Oh, we've got them, you know, we're happy. You have to actually do something

about them. And I'm going to talk a little bit about how we've been trying to make sure our administration enforces things at UChicago.

So, now the strengths. Okay. The number one strength, I think, is public support. So the woke stuff is super unpopular and the vast majority of people of all races think that evaluations for university admissions and hiring should be done on the basis of merit, for example. They think that, oh, almost -- you know, I think it's about three-quarters of the public thinks that universities should have freedom of expression in place. So that's a big -- that's a big strength.

The second is alumni. So I wore this pin from the MIT Free Speech Alliance. Bill Frezza, who spoke earlier, is -- is either the head of that or one of the big people on it. And so that's a really important group. Carl Neuss is here sitting in the front for Cornell Free Speech. And so there are these alumni networks that have sprung up, people who really care about their institution that they came from, and they want to work with faculty and try to improve the situation. I think that's a big strength.

And fundraising. So University of Austin launched. A lot of people on Twitter who, you know, said that it was really bad and whatever. But there is the \$150 million almost right away. So it doesn't really matter if people say bad things on Twitter if you can go out and -- and raise a

1 bunch of money and do what you want to do. 2 I think the silent majority of students and 3 faculty is on our side. They're -- they have been very silent. But, for example, after I started gotting [sic] -- getting in 5 trouble, I was immediately elected onto the council of the university senate. And so it -- as long as it's an anonymous 6 7 vote, people -- you will sometimes win on those things. Not all the time, but sometimes. 9 And then the last thing is sanity. So if -- if 10 you look at what the woke people say, it's -- it's insane most 11 of the time. And I think the presidents of u- -- of the 12 universities know that, and they -- they have to sort of kowtow 13 to them sometimes, but it is a strength to be able to go in and 14 say something sane to the president and -- and make a rational 15 argument. So I think that's a strength. 16 Okay. Now, I'm going to talk about three plans. Three types of plans. The first is working within 17 18 institutions, the second is starting new institutions, and the 19 third is involving government, which I think will be the most 20 provocative in this crowd, especially since there's a lot of 21 libertarian types. 22 So first working within institutions. 23 woke people work really hard. They -- they know how to grab 24 institutional power and -- and to take things over. And they're a really small percentage of the population. And so

1 that can be depressing, but it can also be, sort of -- you know, it can make us feel optimistic, because we don't have to be -- you don't have to have 90 percent of the people be willing to be active on academic freedom issues. You just have 5 to have, I don't know, five or ten percent of the faculty 6 willing to be obstinate on it. And that could be enough to get 7 a lot done. 8 But we have to be willing to actually work hard, so many of us -- you know, we're interested in our scientific 10 or other scholarly research, and we're not necessarily 11 interested in going and sitting in a bunch of stupid, you know, council meetings or sitting on committees to decide who's the 12 13 next dean or whatever. But I think we're going to have to do 14 that because the other side is doing that. And so that's what 15 working within institutions look like -- looks like. 16 So at UChicago, we founded a group called UChicago Free. We have about 50 faculty members who are 17 18 willing to put their names on our website and publicly say that 19 they support the Kalven Report and the Chicago principles. 20 have a listserv where we discuss these issues, which has been very useful to me. Rick, in particular, has a huge 21 22 institutional memory, Rick Shweder, and has shared with us a 23 lot of former speeches he's made and things that have happened 24 in the past that not everybody would know about. And so these sorts of networks can be very useful.

And we've also done practical things. So, for example, we get people elected to the council of the university senate. Some of these things, you just have to show up to win. And so we've got to start showing up. And then the other thing is, we had -- we have this Kalven Report that the university is supposed to be neutral on social and political issues that was respected until 2020, then all of a sudden, it was just not respected.

And so the provost sort of set the tone by repeatedly putting out statements about how we're supposed to think about social and political stuff, and then it filtered down and every department chair was like, Well, I guess I gotta do this now, and -- and it just went crazy. And so we had, kind of, a two-year battle to get these statements removed that Jerry was one of the leaders of the fight.

And it -- it involved a lot of writing to the president, and eventually we had three meetings with the new president. And finally a process was set up where we can submit an issue to the dean when there's an offending statement put up, and the dean will order the statement down. And if the dean doesn't act, we go to the provost and then we can go to the president. And we've started getting these ta- -- statements taken down, and so far we have 100 percent rate. Every statement we've said is a violation has been taken down. And so that -- that took two years of fighting, but we

eventually got it to happen. And so, you know, this stuff can be useful.

And in terms of starting new institutions, I mentioned the University of Austin before, and so there's -there's scope for sort of big projects like that. But also,
you can do little stuff. And so I founded this Substack, the
Heterodox STEM Substack. And we get submissions from faculty
and students, sometimes anonymous, sometimes signed, and people
can sort of put out what they're thinking and what they're
experiencing. I think that's been very useful to the
community. And so you can try to just do something yourself,
and maybe it works, maybe it doesn't work.

And finally, the provocative controversial idea, so some of these things might take more action, more collective action to get desirable results. And so I'm going to propose two potential ideas for discussion. I'm not necessarily advocating for them, but these are ways that the government could get involved that maybe during this conference, we can talk about more.

So the first is, we talked about the -- the Chicago Trifecta, the Chicago principles, the Kalven Report and the Shils report. You could tie federal funding to adopting and enforcing these principles in some way, somehow like a Title IX kind of a thing. So that's what I did.

And then the second idea, it is a way to enforce

these, is you could -- you could sort of have -- you could enable lawyers to file class action lawsuits if you could prove that a university was not following these. So one thing is, you could tie funding to following them, but you could also sort of say anyone who can -- if you get insider information and you can prove that a university is not actually following these, then you can do a class action lawsuit, and every student who was -- who paid tuition that year gets their tuition refunded or something like that.

And so those are two, sort of, ideas. And I know there's a lot of lawyers and people who know more about this kind of stuff in the audience, but maybe there could be some discussion about that if we have time on this panel.

MR. ARCIDIACONO: All right. So I'm going to take a little bit different path and talk about what we have agency over. When we're operating in a space where our views sort of don't fit in. And I think can summarize it with, sort of, we'll call the three Cs, that we need to have courage, compassion and community. And I think all three of those are super-central to preserving the academic freedom that we're looking for.

If we had courage, you know, some people will think that because I've spoken up on particular things, that I've got courage, and that is so many other things where I haven't spoken up and completely wimped out. You know? And I

1 think that that's true for probably everybody in this room. And I think it -- it's really hard -- hard to have that. So I think figuring out a way to say, Okay, it's worth it for me to -- to -- to do that. 5 It's going to be a lot easier to do those 6 things, though, if you have compassion. You cannot be seeing 7 the other people as not redeemable. So to me, one of the -the best examples of engaging on ac- -- on what we're looking for is what fair does. And I think in particular, that Daryl 10 Davis symbolizes that incredibly well. The idea that, you 11 know, a black jazz musician can go talk to people in the KKK and get them to turn over their hoods, if -- if he could do 12 13 that, you know, that's what -- that's what we really need --14 need to be about. 15 So I think that part of the reason I've been 16 able to survive, given the views that I have, given the 17 research that I've done is because of my relationships with 18 people who disagree with me. And I've got plenty of those 19 people who I love and care about. And I've learned a ton from 20 They say that, you know, it's really bad for 21 conservatives, but the reality is, I end up learning a ton 22 because my arguments actually get challenged. And when you 23 don't have those arguments get challenged, you're just 24 intellectually soft, and it doesn't -- you know, I think that's a big barrier.

You know, my kids go to a school that's a classical school, and they have what's called grammar, logic and rhetoric. And I think a lot of times in an environment like this, we're really focused on the logic. But the issue of communicating those ideas in ways that other people can actually hear is huge. You know, I think about Jonathan Haidt's book quite a bit and the -- you know, why is it that people believe what they believe and the ability to describe that?

I have faculty members who are warned before they come to -- to join our faculty that I'm a racist. And that sucks, right? I mean, that definitely sucks. But I'm committed to having relationship with these people, and so they know that that's not the case, right? That requires me not just sticking to, you know, dehumanization of the other side, but to put up with -- with being called those things and engage anyway and to love them anyway. And I think if -- if we do that, that's how the battle really turns.

I'm not actually -- I disagree with the mockery. You know, I think it can be in good fun; but fundamentally, we need to be having the relationship with those other people. Some of those other people -- there's a set who are not going to want to have any relationship with us. That's fine. But there's enough other people out there that we can engage with where that -- that can work out.

And so then on the last part, which is on the commit -- on the community, you know, that's where it's really important to have each other's backs on these types of things. And that involves, you know, sending the emails to be encouraging when you see people going through those times. really like -- Joshua Kats has a great article on the culture of the canceled. When you read that ar- -- there's other people out there. And that's what can allow you to have the courage to speak -- to speak out. That's it. MODERATOR: Thank you. MR. ROSE: Okay. Well, I think I'll open my remarks with a disclaimer, which is my focus is fairly narrow. 12 The things that I'm working on are limited to freedom of speech on campus and not the larger governance issues. But the --I've recently published an article that's called Conquering the Climate of Fear. And climate of fear is a -- it hallows back to the language of the blacklist. And I used that intentionally because there's a great deal of fear to speak out freely on campus. And there's two types of fear. The first one is fear of being sanctioned by the university itself in some 22 capacity. And the second, perhaps the more important fear, is the fear of the reaction of your fellow students, usually, or of your colleagues, and the social sanction that comes along with that. I only have a limited amount of time, so I -- but I

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

think it's more important. I can't talk about the second fear.

So I'll talk about the first fear and try to offer practical solutions, which is what this panel is for -for that. All right. With regard to freedom of speech on campus, the problem is not that there isn't commitment from universities to that. Every public university is already committed to freedom of speech because it's bound by the First Amendment.

The sense in which its -- the universities are committed to freedom of speech is a sense governed by the First Amendment, which is you must be free to express ideas, and you can't be punished for the content of our speech. The content of the speech is what's protected.

Other aspects of speech, like, if you're insulting, if it's fraud, if it's libel, if it's all of these things, if you're speaking on a loud speaker that you're bothering people, that's regulatable. What's protected is the content of your ideas, and if they're offensive, you can't be punished for that. First Amendment protects that.

For private universities, it's basically the same. There's, I think, over 100 universities now that have adopted the Chicago principles. The Chicago principles were written by constitutional lawyers to make the restrictions of the First Amendment applicable to the universities if you -- as the university adopts that, they voluntarily apply the same

commitment to themselves.

And even universities that haven't exclusively

adopted the Chicago principles, if you look at their policy

statements, they contain words like "broadest," "untrammeled,"

"most extensive," "unfettered." This is the language that they

use to describe the commitment of freedom of speech. So

universities are committed to freedom of speech. The problem

is not the commitment. The problem is that the commitment's

not enforced. That's where we should be focusing our

attention.

All right. Think about it. The purpose of university speech policies is to restrain the actions of the university's administrators, the deans, the provosts, the presidents who enforces the speech policies. The administrators, the deans, the provosts, the presidents. It's not surprising that the enforcement is somewhat lax, right? You put the wrong people in charge.

The problem here is -- I teach in the law school. I also teach in the business school. It's -- occupationally, I have to learn to look at incentives. So the problem here has a lot to do with incentives. There's no -centive -- incentive for enforcement. I said to someone on the way in that many people who research this have -- who work on this have to go out and research all of the instance- -- instances about lack of enforcement in other universities. I

don't. I work at Georgetown University. I just have to go -- go down the list of what we've done the last seven years.

There's great examples of why it isn't enforced. Instead of wasting time on that, I -- I'll just read you an example. We get campus climate newsletters all of the time from the -- there's an update on inclusion and strengthening our campus climate. We're committed to free speech. We've adopted the Chicago statement, yet we get emails like this. The relevant excerpt is, Many of you may have been made aware about racially-insensitive messages posted anonymously on the new social media app, Flock, which somebody must know what that is. We will be continuing to investigate these incidents. If anyone has any information on these messages, we urge you to report them to the Office of Institutional Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.

So it's not just that people have made insensitive comments that are offensive. It's that the university is investigating them and incentivizing everyone else to inform on the people who are saying the wrong thing. That seems fairly antithetical to the commitment made by the Chicago statements which the university has adopted.

All right. That's a problem. What's the solution? The solution is to change the incentives. The people who have -- no dean gets rewarded for upholding an abstract commitment. But if there's dissension going on and

students are going to cancel classes and there's a big -- it's a big problem, their job is to keep the school going. They respond to their incentives.

In my experience, deans are not bad people, they're not evil people, and they're certainly not ideali- -- idealized. Right, they're administrators. They're not idealized. They just have a job to do, and they respond to their incentives, which is to keep the school going. So they have no incentive to uphold the -- the principle. What we can do. I'll give you two practical solutions.

The first one is you have to write a particular clause into the speech and expression policy. I'll call it a "safe harbor clause." You get this sentence in the -- the speech policy, and that's step one. Uni- -- the university will summarily dismiss any allegation that an individual or group has violated a policy of the university if it determines the allegation to be based solely on the individual or group's expression of his, her or its religious philosophical literary artistic, political or scientific viewpoints.

So you write the explicit commitment into the university's speech and expression policy. Why is that important? If it goes into our faculty handbook, it's now legally binding on the university. In many states, that's the case. In other states, even if it's not definitely legally binding, it can be grounds for a lawsuit. We -- they've now

1 made a commitment to free speech, not in the abstract, but a real binding commitment that's legally enforceable. That's 3 Step 1. Step 2, this only works if you also have a 5 widespread network of pro bono legal organizations which FIRE 6 is in -- has already created or is in the process of creating 7 people who will represent those that are -- whose speech is suppressed at no cost. Nobody can afford to do it themselves. There's no return. But if you have people who are dedicated to 10 freedom of speech and will bring lawsuits when universities --11 let's say some -- subject somebody to a four-month 12 investigation because of what he said and make the 13 investigation to punishment, then we have something that will 14 change incentives. 15 At least in my university, university counsel is not in the business of winning lawsuits. University counsel's 16 17 in the business of preventing lawsuits. And if universities 18 can be sued whenever they violate this particular provision, 19 they investigate people because of speech, it's not going to 20 change the dean's incentives, it's not going to change the provost's incentive. It will change university counsel's 21 22 incentive, but that is an important incentive to change, 23 because that person will start saying, We have to have

different training, we have to have different rules. So that's

Step 1.

Another possibly so- -- possible solution, too, which is change the decision-making locus. So you create a prophylactive in this sense. I'm the chair of the grievance committee at Georgetown. We have something called the initial review committee for grievances. You have an initial review committee for accusations of violations of freedom of speech. Before anything is pursued, before there's any kind of investigation, the issue goes to the initial review committee. That committee is made up of people who understand the difference between speech and conduct. They know the legal distinction. They -- they're -- it's good if their lawyers understand the constitutional distinction. At least in my case, it's better if they're not faculty. You don't want faculty making this decision, but you have people who know the difference between speech and conduct, it goes through them first. That group instantly dismisses anything based solely on the content of ideas, content of speech, and only allows complaints to go forward if they find that there is some conduct that could violate policy. That changes the location of decision-making. It's another way of changing incentives. So my suggestion is that if you want to make the commitments realistic, then you just simply don't just call people names and don't say we're in a ideal- -- idealogical

struggle. The issue is usually incentive structure, people do

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

what they're incentivized to do. You don't want to hope for A and pay for B. Change the incentives and things should work out. MODERATOR: Thank you. Richard, I was, like, hoping to get your reaction because, obviously, your suggestion was quite more extreme than many of the other practical solutions that your fellow panelists sort of made. So what makes you pes- -- I'm assuming you're pessimistic about the potential for success with some of these strategies, so what's your reaction? MR. LOWERY: So I think they're -- the strategies themselves are good. What I do not see is any hope of actually getting them implemented, because there's nobody who actually wants to do that who has the power to do it. I mean, maybe the alumni do, but the alumni get ignored because it's not all of them and their money can be replaced with money

the other side than on our side, so your -- your alumni are not

from more DEI focused -- you know, there's way more money on

going to be able to force to do it. The board, not going to do

anything. So I don't know how you get to the point where these

incentives are changed.

So -- and I -- and I think we've run the risk of telling ourselves stories about how things are that are how -- kind of how we want them to be, like, if we reach out to the people, you know, we -- we can convince people. And I -- I

1

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

```
1
   just don't see empirical evidence of that. It doesn't -- you
2
   know, Chicago is sort of a holdout, but I don't see a lot of
   indication that we can actually get these things through at
   private schools.
5
                  MODERATOR: Anybody else wants...
6
                  MR. ROSE: Yeah. At least in my case, that's
7
   not -- a hundred schools have adopted the Chicago principles,
   they must have done -- they did that voluntarily.
                  MR. LOWERY: Right. But they can -- you -- you
9
10
   can write anything down you want.
11
                  MR. ROSE:
                             Right.
12
                  MR. LOWERY: You can carve that into a lake for
13
   all the good it does --
14
                  MR. ROSE: O- -- okay.
15
                  MR. LOWERY: -- but you're not enforcing it.
16
                  MR. ROSE: So then that means you could also get
17
   them to adopt safe harbor provisions. What I propose is to
18
   make the commitment self-enforcing. You can't -- you can't
19
   make people do things that they don't believe in.
20
   self-enforcing. It -- the individual whose speech is being
21
   attacked can sue the university. And the universities are
   afraid of lawsuit.
22
23
                  MR. LOWERY:
                               Right.
                                       But --
24
                  MR. ROSE: It's a way of making it
   self-enforcing rather than trying to make people do something
```

```
1
   different at the top level.
2
                  MR. LOWERY: But now you're talking about change
3
   from the government.
                  MR. ROSE: No.
5
                  MR. LOWERY: Well, who -- who's going to make
6
   the lawsuits easier?
7
                  MR. ROSE: FIRE.
                                     They've already made a network
   of pro bono lawyers across the country who will take these
           There's no government. People whose speech is
10
   suppressed have been given a legal avenue for complaining --
11
   because you -- the problem at my school, I'm in the grievance
12
   committee, the -- the people -- they just leave because it's
13
   not worth it. It's -- there's no threat.
14
                  But if you can bring a lawsuit against the
15
   university and the university's afraid of that, things can
16
   change. Obviously, it can change because they -- the schools
17
   adopt the Chicago principles, they can adopt this as well.
18
                  MR. LOWERY: Right. I mean, I'm the last person
19
   who's going to say that suing universities is a bad idea, but
20
   the policy change -- again, so you think the policy change
21
   comes from the lawsuits not -- not a policy change
22
   voluntarily --
23
                  MR. ROSE: Absolutely.
24
                  MR. LOWERY: -- and that -- that I -- you know,
   I'm more sympathetic to that. I still don't think it'll work,
```

```
1
   but...
2
                  MODERATOR: Any other reactions before we, like,
3
   open it up for Q&A? No? All right. Then we'll go into Q&A.
   Please remember to, like, introduce yourself and keep your
5
   questions brief.
6
                                         How do I turn the -- oh.
                  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
7
                  MODERATOR: Whoever has a microphone, that's
8
   sort of the determining factor.
                                     Okay.
9
                  MS. WAX: Yeah. I wanted to -- I am going to
10
   say something very partisan here.
11
                  MODERATOR: Can you please introduce yourself?
12
                  MS. WAX: Can you -- can you hear me?
13
                  MODERATOR: Yeah. Can you introduce yourself,
14
   please?
15
                  MS. WAX: Oh, I'm Amy Wax. I'm a professor at
16
   the University of Pennsylvania Law School. I'm going to say
   something very partisan here. I think that there is potential
17
18
   for the government to take action. I know conservatives and
19
   libertarians are reluctant to push that, and I understand that
20
   perfectly. But there is an effort on to get legislators
21
   interested in trying to reform higher education.
22
                  And of course, the only legislators who are
23
   interested in doing anything like that are Republicans.
24
   Democrats are a total loss. Democrats are not your friend
   here, they are not going to do anything to undermine wokeism or
```

1 progressiveism or the growth of DIE bureaucracies in the university. They are 100 percent behind those trends. 3 So what can legislators do, Republican 4 legislators? Well, there's lots, but I think the real model 5 here is Title VI. Title VI says that universities, private, 6 public or otherwise, that want to receive federal funds must abide by certain rules. They can't discriminate on the basis of race, sex, et cetera, et cetera. One could leverage Title VI by imposing additional requirements, including every 10 university taking federal funds must adopt First Amendment 11 principles. Every university taking federal funds must write 12 into its faculty handbook and its rules the kind of rules that 13 Don Hasnus (phonetic) is talking about, that all complaints 14 based on speech, rather than action, shall be immediately 15 dismissed. 16 They could empower private individuals to sue. 17 Require the appointment of university officials who -- of 18 course, we don't like bureaucracy, but I think this one 19 bureaucrat we could tolerate, to oversee speech violations and 20 complaint of a justice department and enforce these rules. 21 I could go on and on. There are a lot of measures here and, 22 you know, Professor Abbot also has alluded to some of those 23 that could be adopted if there was the power and the 24 inclination to do that. 25 MODERATOR: What's your reaction to that?

1 I -- so I forgot to mention MR. ABBOT: Yeah. 2 one thing. At UChicago, I filed eight Title VI and Title IX 3 complaints in the last year against programs that were illegally discriminating on the basis of sex or race, and the univers- -- the -- I filed them to the Title IX coordinator, who was not particularly receptive to these complaints. 6 7 there were things like physics graduate student fellowships only for women, just as an example. 9 But after a year of pressing her and emailing 10 again and again, and it went through the university counsel, they admitted that seven out of the eight had to be removed and 11 12 they were discontinued. And so those -- those sorts of efforts can be useful. And if we could add more stipulations for 13 14 academic freedom, I think that would make a big difference. 15 MODERATOR: Jonathan? 16 MR. BERK: I want to -- I want to go back to Dorian's point because I think that that's --17 18 MODERATOR: Can you also introduce yourself? 19 MR. BERK: Oh. Oh, I'm sorry, I did already. 20 Jonathan Berk, Professor of Finance in the Grad School of Business. Because I think of all the -- of all the 21 22 suggestions, the only one that was made that you could put in 23 place right away is the suggestion of the class action lawsuit. 24 And my question is, I don't really understand why this hasn't come up. So in the state of California, it's even stronger.

1 There is a state law that does not allow a university or any institution to discriminate the basis of race, gender and you 3 go down the list. We -- I'm not just advertising. Certainly, California is for California. Berkley definitely does 5 discriminate on that basis, right? And I don't think it would 6 be that hard to prove. 7 Now, if that's true, it means that many people who were denied the employment opportunities at that institution, right, who you would think would have a 10 pretty big -- because getting a job at the University of 11 California is a pretty prestigious thing to get. 12 don't get that job, that would be costly. And you didn't get 13 it because they violated state law, it would seem like the 14 university's very exposed. And the University of 15 California-Berkley has an enormous endowment. 16 So you would think that they would be a --17 lawyers would say, My God, there's some money here, right? 18 mean, I -- I mean, I get these letters from class action 19 lawsuits for nonsense, right, that the lawyers have made a lot 20 of money out of. Why has that not occurred? 21 MR. ABBOT: Yeah, so there's -- so two 22 improvements would be if you give it class action status and 23 who has standing. So right now, it has to be a person -- a 24 specific person who is discriminated against who has to do the lawsuit. And so if you could somehow let the lawyers go at it

1 like sharks, that would be better. But there is a professor I'm aware of who's -- who's suing Texas A&M because of some discrimination that they engaged in. And I think here's -- but to answer your question directly -- sorry for hemming and hawing. The real reason is, you have to be a crazy 6 person who doesn't care if you have friends to file such a 7 lawsuit. 8 And so you're immediately blacklisted. Everybody -- you'll never get another job, everybody will hate 10 you and -- if you file a lawsuit on this basis. And I think 11 that's what's preventing the lawsuits. 12 MR. ROSE: I'm -- I'm going to dis- -- I'm going 13 to disagree with the premise of the question. It's not obvious 14 that universities have crossed the border, engaged in illegal 15 discrimination, and it's not an easy lawsuit to win. 16 from my own university, all of the materials they publish on 17 this are scrupulously and carefully written to skirt legality 18 and not cross the line. 19 You know, we're allowed to engage in affirmative 20 action and outreach. We're allowed to do all kinds of things to encourage minorities to apply for jobs in the school. 21 can't make the selection on these basis. That's what's 22 23 illegal. And nowhere in the years I've been there has my 24 university ever put out something that tells us to cross the line and do things illegally. We may get the message.

```
1
   minds, people who believe in racial decision-making may make
   the decision on that basis. But the -- it's extremely unlikely
3
   that you'll win a lawsuit or a class action lawsuit unless
   you've got some kind of smoking gun.
5
                  MR. BERK: You're right about Georgetown, and
6
   it's true about Stanford because they're lawyers and they --
7
   there's a huge endowment to worry about. But it's not true
   about the University of California-Berkeley. Go and look at --
   they have examples of correct diversity statements.
10
                              That's right and it's not illegal.
                  MR. ROSE:
11
                  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) may I ask
12
   a -- I have a practical question on the same thing, because
13
   MIT -- I'm with the MIT Free Speech Alliance, Eric
14
   (Inaudible) -- is currently having the faculty consider
15
   adopting something like the Chicago principles, and I was
   trying to persuade the -- the faculty who are doing this that
16
17
   all the brand general statements can be dropped if they would
18
   just put in they agree that MIT will be bound by the same First
19
   Amendment law as state universities and they don't get it.
20
   They don't get why that's more important than saying, free
21
   speech is guaranteed to everyone in the world at MIT. So how
22
   do you persuade engineering professors, say, that they have to
23
   get down to -- to nitty-gritty with law?
24
                  MR. ROSE: I spent two years doing that.
   spend two years doing it, right? Get -- get used to explaining
```

1 what the law is and what the words mean over and over and over 2 And then after you get it through one group and it 3 come -- it comes back wrong, you do it again. Right? You could just say, We'll apply the First 5 Amendment to ourselves. That's all it takes. But they don't 6 know what the First Amendment means. The Chicago principles 7 are a way of saying, this is what the First Amendment means, all you have to do is adopt them. But the le- -- it's -- it's not easy. Work inside of bureaucracy or inside a university bureaucracy, which is worse, figure it's going to take two 10 11 It took me from 2015 to 2017 before Georgetown adopted it, and then they didn't enf- -- and I'm still working on it 12 13 because then they wouldn't enforce it. Just put your head down 14 and say, you know, I'm going to get this through. 15 MR. NADON: Yeah. My name is Christopher Nadon. 16 I'm currently in the process of getting fired at Claremont 17 McKenna College. And -- and -- and so my question has some 18 practical -- personal practical applications as well. Dorian 19 Abbot talked about how there's a possibility of having someone 20 with insider information who comes forward and the other cases that bring forth wrongdoing. How does one, then, get around 21 22 the problem that then that leaves the person who provides the 23 inside information as open to being fired on the basis of 24 various kinds of violation of confidentialities, which colleges are certainly quite good at putting into statute and enforcing?

```
1
                  MR. LOWERY: I better not say anything about
2
   that either.
3
                  MR. ABBOT: But you could -- in the abstract,
   you could talk about.
5
                  MR. LOWERY:
                               No.
                                     I'm on very --
6
                  MR. ROSE: You've identified -- you've
7
   identified a real issue, a real problem. If you have
   confidential information, you know the university is lying and
   you reveal it, you're serving a cause but you've broken your
10
   own nondisclosure agreement and they can go after you for that
11
   and they will.
                   That's a serious problem.
12
                  MR. ABBOT: Some state universities, can't you
13
   get a Freedom of Information Act and, like, look at all the
14
   emails people have been sending or something like that?
15
                             Perhaps that's a good idea.
                  MR. ROSE:
16
                  MODERATOR: Who has the mic?
17
                  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right here.
18
                  MR. KAUFMANN: Hello? Can you hear me?
19
   Er- -- Eric Kaufmann, Birkbeck College, University of London
20
   political science. I'll be speaking later, so I don't want to
   hog floor time here. Just -- I, quick, want to say that just
21
22
   this discussion, I think, brings home Amy's point that, really,
23
   we've got to get government and legislation involved because if
24
   you talk about the law, I mean, like many of you, I've been
   through these internal investigations, and what they'll do is
```

they'll always throw your freedom of speech under the bus compared to our policy in work and study, which, of course, they always reference back to the legislative framework around not creating a hostile environment for designated groups and without specifying what takes precedent over what. And of course, they're violating, actually, these laws all the time. But still, without getting government involved, I don't see how we can crack this nut, 'cause they're always going to sort of use -- whether it's civil rights law or whether it's written in the 2010 Equality Act provisions about not fostering positive relationships between -- they will always drag out something that will trump your free speech. I -- I think unless that is finally tuned, finely specified in law, we're not going to get anywhere. MODERATOR: Any reactions to the question? MR. ROSE: Yeah, I'm sorry. It's -- it's not an unfamiliar role for me, but I guess it's my role to be a contrarian here. The last thing we want is to get the government involved. What you want is to get indi- -- empower individuals to enforce their rights themselves. An analogy -there's a difference between legislation and civil liability. You want people who are subjected to this to be able to bring pressure on the university to vindicate their

rights as faculty members, as students. You know, the last

thing you want is the government making the rules. How'd we

1

2

3

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 get to the position we're in now? The leg- -- you don't want politicians involved in this. The problem is that these are 3 too politically motivated. What you want to do is empower individuals to enforce their rights themselves, and you can do 5 that by making the policies specific enough so that you can 6 have a FIRE lawyer come in and sue for you in case your rights 7 are violated. 8 MR. NEUSS: Carl Neuss. I'm representing the National Alumni Free Speech Alliance as well as Cornell Free 10 Speech Alliance. And we're very proud of a gentleman by the 11 name of Leonard Leo, who is a Cornell grad and founder of the 12 Federalist Society. In trying to get advice from him, I had a 13 very long conversation, and he listened to me for about an 14 hour, and then he had two words of advice, which picks up on 15 Richard's idea. And he said brand tarnishment. 16 And the -- what -- what -- whether you're woke 17 or whether you're on the right, I'm sure all this fa- -- all 18 faculty, irregard- of -- of what your -- your political 19 persuasion is, what's most important to you if you're at 20 Stanford is that you're a Stanford faculty member and you're very extremely proud of that. You don't want that to be 21 tarnished, regardless of what side of the political spectrum 22 23 you're on. And so I -- I wonder what the potential there is. 24 And not that we need to tarnish the brand, but we've had some success at Cornell, in particular, of pointing

1 out that Cornell is tarnishing its own brand, the administrators are tarnishing their brand. In particular, Randy Wayne was very important because they -- they canceled Lincoln, and they -- Cornell happens to be the owner of one Linc- -- the Gettysburg Address in Lincoln's own hand and a 6 bust done of -- of Lincoln in his last days of -- of his life. 7 And they -- they -- they canceled him. And once we threw a spotlight on that, a small group of people associated with the faculty in our group, it was amazing how 10 fast the university capitulated. But unless someone threw a 11 spotlight on it, no one -- it would have gone unnoticed and 12 un- -- undealt with. So any comments on that strategy in terms 13 of trying to turn things around? 14 MR. ARCIDIACONO: So I think transparency's 15 really a key thing and that the more transparency you get, the 16 more you can see some of those things. You know, you've got 17 the case before the Supreme Court right now, and one of the 18 things that's hurt Harvard a lot is what's exposed in their 19 admissions processes. You know, Gorsuch just hammered on the 20 fact that it was the squash team. Over and over again, we're 21 giving free admission to the squash players. 22 Those types of things, I think -- I think 23 transparency is key to the whole operation. I think it's a --24 a moral wrong that universities don't use their data to help their students. And that if we actually vested in having

universities show their data, then I think we could actually make a lot of great progress. And some of these debates that we're having about DEI and such, they actually have implications for the empirics where we should evaluate it. So -- and my son's a -- a sophomore at Notre Dame now and -- and part of his first year experience, he had to read something by Robin DiAngelo with no counter. And that really bothered me, and -- but the -- the thing about it is, is I may think that Robin DiAngelo's work is toxic, but I'd be perfectly okay if you did a randomized thing where we're going to give half the people stuff from FAIR and half the people Robin DiAngelo and then evaluate. But I think what we really need to be pushing for -- and part of the practical solution I forgot to mention is pushing universities to be transparent to say, Look, I want empathy across, you know, I want to solve racial issues, I disagree with your solutions. Give me the data so we can actually evaluate what works. And I think that through that, you know, that's a roundabout way of getting to the -- the -the talk- -- the -- the branding issue. I think a lot gets exposed. MR. LOWERY: Can I -- could I jump -- so I mean, I'm -- I'm obviously very much in line with the idea of brand tarnishing, but I think there's a fundamental difference of opinion between, sort of, what my approach is and what --

1

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 what -- that is getting in the i- -- the -- I think the idea there is, Oh, we'll tarnish their brand and they'll respond and fix things and things will get better, my argument would be, if you really dig down and you look at this -- and I've spent many years looking at this -- there's not stuff under the hood worth 6 salvaging. 7 Like, we're not going to fix univer- -- if you look at the personnel, you look at how people have behaved over the past 30, 40, years, it's not the right set of people to be 10 doing this job. We just -- it's not -- we need to tarnish the 11 brand to where we replace it with something else, not, like, 12 course correct a little bit. We've got totally the wrong 13 people, we've got totally the wrong institutions. We just need to go in that direction, I think. 15 MODERATOR: All right. I think we have, like, 16 time for two more questions, so --17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. 18 MODERATOR: -- and the gentleman at the center 19 table had his hand up from the very beginning, so if you can 20 make sure... 21 MR. CARVALHO: So Carlos Carvalho from the Salem 22 Center, the University of Texas. I just had a question on the 23 legislation side and then -- I'm sorry -- on the litigation 24 side, where, sure, we can sue universities (inaudible) in violation of First -- the First Amendments rights are -- are --

```
1
   are -- take -- take place and they take place all the time and
   there's some -- some lawsuits coming out (inaudible) on that.
   But my understanding -- and I'm married to an attorney so I --
   I -- you know, talk a lot about that with her -- is that the
   punitive damages for the university are very low on this. It's
6
   like a slap on the wrist is my dean apologizing for violating
7
   my First Amendment rights.
8
                  And that's -- they sit on billions of dollars of
   endowment, so they're not afraid of that.
                                              It's like, Oh, sure,
10
   yeah, sue me. It's going to be costing us time, money,
11
   prestige. My colleagues won't talk to me, whatever, right, if
12
   I go and engage in that lawsuit. And, yeah, the punishment is,
13
   like, literally a slap on the wrist. There's not -- nobody's
14
   going to give you money to pay for -- is that correct?
15
   that -- do you see a different route where you actually get
16
   some actual punishment to universities?
17
                  MR. ROSE: You're entirely correct.
                                                        These
18
   lawsuits wouldn't produce large punitive (inaudible).
19
   possible you can get a case where it would, but they typically
20
   wouldn't produce large punitive damages award. They may only
21
   have very moderate compensatory damage awards, although in some
22
   cases the defamation effect on the person's character, a
23
   professor's character could be significant.
24
                  But you don't need some massive punitive damage
   award in one case for this to have an effect, because if all of
```

```
1
   the universities have these policies in place, and every time
   somebody is punished for speech, there's a law- -- university
   counsel's not about winning. It's about preventing lawsuits.
   Even if they're a couple -- $10,000 a shot, you get the
5
   deterrent effect where the university -- my counsel's always
6
   talking to us about how we can't do this, not because it's
7
   wrong, but because somebody might sue us.
8
                  What you want is university counsel to be the
   party motivated to change the internal structures and
10
   incentives so that people don't -- you know, deans don't feel
11
   like it's okay to punish speech just to mollify the students.
12
   And over time, gradually, you can make a difference this way.
13
   You don't need big damages award, you just need the suit
14
   brought and to be something. You can't do that now because of
15
   litigation costs, but Fire's solving that problem for us by
16
   providing lawyers at no cost.
17
                  It's a step-by-step gradual thing. It can work.
18
   I don't have any magic bullet that does it tomorrow.
                                                          Let's
19
   just change the incentives.
20
                  MODERATOR: Anybody else want to react to that?
21
                  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Quick comment.
22
                  MODERATOR: All right. Then, yeah.
23
                  MR. ETCHEMENDY: My name is John Etchemendy.
24
   I'm a -- a -- a professor here in philosophy. I'm -- I was the
   provost for a while. And I -- I just want to act as a
```

1 megaphone to John, I agree with everything you said -- you've 2 said, John. And -- and --3 MR. ROSE: That never happens. 4 MR. ETCHEMENDY: Especially with philosophers. 5 The important thing that I think people may be missing is that 6 if you can get that sentence that he read off into the faculty handbook, that is the employment contract. At that point, you no longer have to worry about a class action suit or who is -you know, who's going to have the -- the guts to -- to file a 10 class action suit. Then it becomes an individual suit if -- if 11 the university violates that and does not follow that -- that 12 sentence, then the individual who has been wronged can sue. 13 And -- and -- and that will happen. 14 So I -- I think it's -- that is the most 15 brilliant strategy I've heard in a long time. Now, signing on 16 to these statements, the Chicago statement, I -- I think that's 17 wonderful, but that is not going to be enforceable. So -- so I 18 think that, you know, I -- I would very much like to see more 19 people appreciate the -- the importance of enforceability. 20 Oh, and by the way -- so Richard, I disagree 21 with just about everything you said. But in particular, who 22 runs the university? It is the faculty. It really is the 23 faculty. The faculty power -- the faculty have the power to 24 get a president fired. It's not the board, not at all the board. I mean, you're -- you're absolutely right about the

```
1
           They're -- they don't know what they're -- what they're
   board.
   doing. But the faculty run the university and if we can get
   the faculty to push for something like that change in the
   faculty handbook, we could actually get something done.
   problem -- now getting back to Amy's point, the problem is that
   our faculties tend to be very, very liberal and -- and very
   much have bought into, you know, the DEI agenda. So -- so I
   don't know if that's going to happen. I -- but I -- I do think
   that that strategy is exactly the right way to go.
10
                              I have that before our faculty senate
                  MR. ROSE:
11
   right now at Georgetown.
12
                  MODERATOR: All right. Well, please join me in
13
   thanking the panelists.
14
                   (End of recording.)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 CERTIFICATE 2 I, TERRI GARCIA, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for 3 the State of Texas, certify that the foregoing is a correct 4 transcription from the audio recording of the proceedings in 5 the above-entitled matter. 6 I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which 7 8 this hearing was taken, and further that I am not financially 9 or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action. 10 I further certify that the transcription fee of 11 _____ was paid/will be paid in full by 12 13 14 15 Terri Garcia, Texas Certified 16 Shorthand Reporter No. 6581 Dickman Davenport, Inc. 17 Firm Registration No. #312 4228 North Central Expressway 18 Suite 101 Dallas, Texas 75206 19 (214) 855-5100 My commission expires: 7-31-23 20 21 22 23 24 25

	admitted 29:11	analogy 35:20	attorney 40:3	6:17 23:13 31:1
A	adopt 25:17	analyze 2:4	audience 14:12	34:1 39:3
A&M 31:2	26:17,17 28:10	analyze 2.4 anonymous 10:6	audio 44:4	big 9:11,11,14,20
Abbot 8:3 28:22	33:8	13:8	Austin 9:21 13:4	13:5 15:25 21:1
29:1 30:21	adopted 18:22	anonymously	authority 3:23	21:2 29:14
33:19 34:3,12	19:3 20:8,21	20:10	avenue 26:10	30:10 41:13
abide 28:7	25:7 28:23	answer 31:4	award 40:20,25	Bill 9:13
ability 16:8	33:11	antithetical	41:13	billions 4:16,16
able 10:13 15:16	adopting 13:22	20:20	awards 40:21	4:21 40:8
24:19 35:23	32:15	Anybody 25:5	awarus 40.21 aware 20:9 31:2	
above-entitled	adopts 18:25	41:20	awful 4:15,20	binding 21:23,25 22:2
44:5	advertising 30:3	· -	5:17	Birkbeck 34:19
absolutely 26:23	C	anymore 5:15 7:23	3.17	bit 2:12 5:16 9:1
42:25	advice 36:12,14		B	14:15 16:7
abstract 20:25	advocating 13:17 affirmative 31:19	anyway 16:17,17	$\overline{\mathbf{B}}$ 24:2	
22:1 34:3		apologize 2:17	back 2:7 3:2	39:12
ac- 15:8	afford 22:8	apologizing 40:6	17:16 29:16	black 15:11
academic 1:11	afraid 25:22	app 20:11	33:3 35:3 43:5	blacklist 17:17
2:4,7 8:17,18	26:15 40:9	applicable 18:24	backs 17:3	blacklisted 31:8
11:4 14:20	agency 4:24	applications	bad 9:23,25	board 3:18,19
29:14	14:16	33:18	15:20 21:4	4:8 24:19 42:24
accusations 23:6	agenda 43:7	apply 18:25	26:19	42:25 43:1
act 12:21 34:13	agree 8:8 32:18	31:21 33:4		boards 3:21 6:21
35:10 41:25	42:1	appointment	bankrupt 6:21	bono 22:5 26:8
action 13:14,15	agreement 34:10	28:17	bankruptcy 5:1	book 16:7
14:2,7 27:18	allegation 21:15	appointments	barrier 15:25	border 31:14
28:14 29:23	21:17	8:18	based 21:17	bothered 38:8
30:18,22 31:20	Alliance 9:13	appreciate 42:19	23:17 28:14	bothering 18:17
32:3 42:8,10	32:13 36:9,10	approach 6:20	basically 4:9	bought 43:7
44:7,9	allow 17:8 30:1	38:25	18:20	bound 18:7 32:18
actionable 2:6,8	allowed 31:19,20	ar- 17:7	basis 8:18 9:8	brand 7:15 32:17
actions 19:12	allows 23:18	ARCIDIACO	28:7 29:4 30:2	36:15,24 37:1,2
active 11:4	alluded 28:22	14:14 37:14	30:5 31:10,22	38:23 39:2,11
actual 3:23 6:5	alumni 9:12,17	argument 7:1	32:2 33:23	branding 38:20
40:16	24:15,15,18	10:15 39:3	battle 12:14	brief 27:5
add 29:13	36:9	arguments 15:22	16:18	brilliant 42:15
additional 28:9	amazing 37:9	15:23	beginning 39:19	bring 5:2 22:10
Address 37:5	Amendment 18:8	article 17:6,15	begins 2:1	26:14 33:21
administration	18:11,19,24	artistic 21:19	behaved 39:8	35:23
9:2	28:10 32:19	aside 6:4	believe 16:8,8	brings 34:22
administrators	33:5,6,7 40:7	aspects 18:14	25:19 32:1	broadest 19:4
19:13,15 21:6	Amendments	associated 37:9	Berk 29:16,19,20	broken 34:9
37:2	39:25	assuming 24:9	32:5	brought 41:14
admission 37:21	amount 17:25	attacked 25:21	Berkley 30:4	bullet 41:18
admissions 9:7	Amy 27:15	attention 19:10	best 15:8	bunch 3:19,21
37:19	Amy's 34:22 43:5	attitudes 5:20	better 5:19 6:13	10:1 11:11
I				

			I	
bureaucracies	23:13 25:6 36:6	30:18,22 32:3	17:2	36:11,25 37:1,4
28:1	37:17 40:19,25	42:8,10	companies 7:9	corporate 8:14
bureaucracy	cases 26:9 33:20	classes 21:1	company 7:7	correct 32:9
28:18 33:9,10	40:22	classical 16:2	compared 35:2	39:12 40:14,17
bureaucrat 28:19	cause 34:9 35:8	clause 21:12,13	compassion	44:3
bus 35:1	center 39:18,22	clearly 6:17	14:19 15:6	cost 4:6 22:8
business 3:25	centive 19:22	climate 17:16,16	compensatory	41:16
4:15 19:19	Central 44:17	20:5,7	40:21	costing 40:10
22:16,17 29:21	certain 5:8 28:7	Cochrane 2:2 3:7	complaining	costly 30:12
bust 37:6	certainly 21:5	colleagues 17:24	26:10	costs 4:5 41:15
	30:3 33:25	40:11	complaint 28:20	council 10:5
C	Certified 44:2,15	collective 13:14	complaints 23:18	11:12 12:2
C 44:1,1	certify 44:3,6,10	College 33:17	28:13 29:3,6	counsel 22:15
California 29:25	cetera 28:8,8	34:19	completely 6:12	29:10 41:8 44:6
30:4,4,11	chair 12:12 23:3	colleges 33:24	7:2 14:25	counsel's 22:16
California-Ber	challenged 15:22	come 5:18 6:7,10	conduct 23:10,16	22:21 41:3,5
32:8	15:23	7:23 8:1 16:11	23:19	counter 38:7
California-Ber	chances 4:7	29:25 33:3 36:6	conference 2:3	country 26:8
30:15	change 2:17 3:23	comes 17:24	13:18	couple 41:4
call 14:18 21:12	4:1 20:23 22:14	26:21 33:3,20	confidential 34:8	courage 14:18,22
23:23	22:20,20,21,22	coming 40:2	confidentialities	14:24 17:9
called 11:16 16:2	23:2 24:2 26:2	comment 41:21	33:24	course 2:23 27:22
16:16 17:15	26:16,16,20,20	comments 3:4	Conquering	28:18 35:2,6
23:4	26:21 41:9,19	20:17 37:12	17:15	39:12
campus 8:12	43:3	commission	conservatives	Court 37:17
17:14,19 18:5	changed 24:21	44:19	15:21 27:18	Coyne 8:8
20:5,7	changes 23:20	commit 17:2	consider 32:14	crack 7:2 35:8
cancel 21:1	changing 23:21	commitment	constitutional	crazy 12:13 31:5
canceled 17:7	character 40:22	18:5 19:1,6,8	18:23 23:12	create 6:5 23:2
37:3,7	40:23	20:20,25 21:20	contain 19:4	created 22:6
capacity 17:22	charge 5:9,25	22:1,2 25:18	content 18:12,12	creating 22:6
capital 3:14 4:12	7:23 19:17	commitment's	18:18 23:17,18	35:4
4:19,22 5:1 6:6	check 5:14	19:8	continuing 20:12	cross 31:18,24
6:20	Chicago 8:9,11	commitments	contract 42:7	crossed 31:14
capitulated 37:10	8:21 11:19	23:23	contrarian 35:18	crowd 10:20
care 9:18 15:19	13:21,21 18:22	committed 16:13	controversial	Cs 14:18
31:6	18:22 19:3 20:8	18:7,10 19:7	13:13	culture 17:6
carefully 31:17	20:21 25:2,7	20:7	conversation	currently 32:14
cares 3:21	26:17 32:15	committee 23:4,5	36:13	33:16
Carl 9:15 36:8	33:6 42:16	23:6,9,9 26:12	conversations	
Carlos 39:21	Christopher	committees 11:12	2:23	D
Carvalho 39:21	33:15	communicating	convince 24:25	Dallas 44:18
39:21	civil 35:9,21	16:5	coordination 5:8	damage 40:21,24
carve 25:12	Claremont 33:16	community	coordinator 29:5	damages 40:5,20
case 16:14 21:24	class 14:2,7 29:23	13:11 14:19	Cornell 9:16 36:9	41:13
	CIGOS 17.2, 1 27.23	13.11 17.17	Cornen 7.10 30.7	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

D 20.6	1.4	1 20 14	10.7	
Dame 38:6	deterrent 41:5	diversity 20:14	42:7	especially 10:20
dare 5:24	device 5:8	32:9	empower 28:16	42:4
Daryl 15:9	DI 8:20	doing 5:6,7 6:8	35:19 36:3	et 28:8,8
data 37:24 38:1	DiAngelo 38:7,12	7:9 11:14 27:23	enable 14:2	Etchemendy
38:17	DiAngelo's 38:9	32:16,24,25	encourage 31:21	41:23,23 42:4
Davenport 44:16	Dickman 44:16	39:10 43:2	encouraging 17:5	evaluate 38:4,12
Davis 15:10	DIE 28:1	dollars 4:17,21	endowment	38:18
days 37:6	difference 23:10	40:8	30:15 32:7 40:9	evaluations 9:7
deal 17:18	23:15 29:14	Don 28:13	enf- 33:12	eventually 7:22
dean 11:13 12:19	35:21 38:24	Dorian 2:12	enforce 2:15	12:17 13:1
12:20,21 20:24	41:12	33:18	13:25 28:20	everybody 11:24
40:6	different 14:15	Dorian's 29:17	33:13 35:20	15:1 31:9,9
dean's 22:20	22:24,24 26:1	drag 35:12	36:4	evidence 25:1
deans 19:13,15	40:15	dropped 32:17	enforceability	evil 21:5
21:4 41:10	difficulty 4:24		42:19	exactly 4:19 43:9
debates 38:2	dig 39:4	E	enforceable 22:2	example 5:18 9:8
decide 11:12	direction 39:14	E 44:1,1	42:17	10:4 12:2 20:5
decision 23:14	directly 31:4	earlier 9:13	enforced 19:9	29:8
32:2	dis- 31:12	easier 15:5 26:6	20:3	examples 15:8
decision-making	disagree 8:17	easy 31:15 33:9	enforcement	20:3 32:9
23:2,20 32:1	15:18 16:19	economist 3:12	8:23 19:16,22	excerpt 20:9
dedicated 22:9	31:13 38:17	3:13	19:25	exclusively 19:2
defamation	42:20	education 27:21	enforces 9:2	experience 21:4
40:22	disclaimer 17:12	effect 40:22,25	19:14	38:6
definitely 16:12	discontinued	41:5	enforcing 7:3	experiences 2:12
21:24 30:4	29:12	effort 7:14,21	13:23 25:15	experiencing
dehumanization	discourse 6:25	27:20	33:25	13:10
16:15	discriminate	efforts 2:19	engage 2:14	expires 44:19
DEI 24:17 38:3	28:7 30:2,5	29:12	16:16,24 31:19	explaining 32:25
43:7	discriminated	eight 29:2,11	40:12	explicit 21:20
Democrats 27:24	30:24	either 4:4 9:14	engaged 31:3,14	exposed 30:14
27:24	discriminating	34:2	engagement 2:13	37:18 38:21
denied 30:8	29:4	elected 10:5 12:2	engaging 15:8	express 18:11
department	discrimination	elite 5:6,21	engineering	expression 8:11
12:12 28:20	31:3,15	elite-type 3:20	32:22	9:11 21:12,18
depressing 11:1	discuss 11:20	emailing 29:9	enjoyable 7:17	21:21
describe 16:8	discussion 13:16	emails 17:4 20:8	enormous 30:15	Expressway
19:6	14:13 34:22	34:14	entirely 40:17	44:17
designate 5:8	dismiss 21:15	embarrassing	environment	extensive 19:5
designated 35:4	dismissed 28:15	7:12	5:22 6:14 16:3	extensive 19.3 extra 4:21
designation 6:2	dismissed 28.15 dismisses 23:17	empathy 38:16	35:4	extra 4.21 extreme 24:7
6:18	disrupting 8:13	empirical 25:1	Equality 35:10	extremely 32:2
desirable 13:15	dissension 20:25	empirics 38:4	Equality 33.10 Equity 20:14	36:21
determines 21:16	distinction 2:24	employed 44:7	Equity 20.14 Er- 34:19	JU.41
determines 21.16 determining 27:8	23:11,12	employment 30:8	Eric 32:13 34:19	$oldsymbol{F}$
ucter mining 47.8	23.11,12		1211C 32.13 34.19	
	l	l	l	l

F 44:1	find 3:5 6:15	13:6	23:4 32:5 33:11	23:11 24:12
fa- 36:17	23:19	founder 36:11	43:11	25:13 33:25
fact 37:20	fine 7:16 16:23	four-month	getting 6:13 10:4	34:15
factor 27:8	finely 35:13	22:11	12:22 24:13	Gorsuch 37:19
faculties 43:6	FIRE 22:5 26:7	framework 35:3	30:10 33:16	gotta 12:12
faculty 4:10 9:19	36:6	fraud 18:15	35:7 38:19 39:1	gotting 10:4
10:3 11:5,17	Fire's 41:15	free 5:22 8:11	43:5	governance 3:14
13:7 16:10,11	fired 33:16,23	9:13,16 11:17	Gettysburg 37:5	3:16 17:14
21:22 23:13,14	42:24	18:11 20:7 22:1	give 5:14 21:10	governed 18:10
28:12 32:14,16	firm 4:14,23	32:13,20 35:12	30:22 38:11,17	government
35:24 36:18,20	44:17	36:9,9 37:21	40:14	10:19 13:17
37:9 42:6,22,23	firms 4:4,16	freedom 1:11 2:5	given 15:16,16	26:3,9 27:18
42:23,23 43:2,3	first 2:11 8:5	2:7 9:10 11:4	26:10	34:23 35:7,19
43:4,10	10:17,22 13:20	14:20 17:13	giving 37:21	35:25
fair 15:9 38:11	17:20 18:2,7,10	18:4,7,10 19:6	go 2:10,11,13 3:8	grab 10:23
fairly 17:12	18:19,24 21:11	19:7 22:10 23:6	4:22 5:9,9,19	grad 29:20 36:11
20:20	23:16 28:10	29:14 34:13	6:15,21 7:11,22	gradual 41:17
far 5:7 12:23	32:18 33:4,6,7	35:1	8:5 9:25 10:13	gradually 41:12
fast 37:10	38:6 39:25,25	freely 17:19	12:21,21 15:11	graduate 29:7
fear 17:16,16,18	40:7	Frezza 9:13	16:1 19:24 20:1	grammar 16:2
17:20,21,22,23	fit 14:17	friend 27:24	20:2 23:18 27:3	grants 6:10,16
18:1,2	five 11:5	friends 31:6	28:21 29:16	great 6:8,13 7:11
federal 6:9,16	fix 3:8,10 6:21	front 9:16	30:3,25 32:8	7:17 17:6,18
13:22 28:6,10	39:3,7	full 44:11	34:10 39:14	20:3 38:2
28:11	Flock 20:11	fun 16:20	40:12 43:9	grievance 23:3
Federalist 36:12	floor 34:21	fund 4:13	God 30:17	26:11
fee 44:10	focus 2:8,15 3:19	fundamental	goes 3:5 4:15 6:7	grievances 23:5
feel 11:2 41:10	17:12	38:24	7:14 21:22 23:8	grounds 21:25
fellow 17:23 24:8	focused 16:4	fundamentally	23:16	group 9:15 11:16
fellowships 29:7	24:17	16:20	going 3:8,19 4:8	21:16 23:16
fight 12:15	focusing 2:3 3:12	funding 13:22	4:11 6:20 7:25	33:2 37:8,9
fighting 12:25	19:9	14:4	8:3,4 9:1 10:16	group's 21:17
figure 3:10 33:10	follow 42:11	fundraising 9:21	11:11,13 13:15	groups 35:4
figuring 15:3	following 2:10	funds 28:6,10,11	14:14 15:5	growth 28:1
file 14:2 31:6,10	14:3,4,6	further 44:6,8,10	16:22 17:5	guaranteed
42:9	force 24:19	future 6:3	20:25 21:1,2,8	32:21
filed 29:2,5	foregoing 44:3		22:19,20 24:19	guess 12:12
filtered 12:11	forgot 29:1 38:14	<u> </u>	24:19 26:5,19	35:17
filtering 5:13	former 11:23	gain 2:6	27:9,16,25	gun 32:4
finally 12:18	formulate 8:7	Garcia 44:2,15	31:12,12 33:10	guts 42:9
13:13 35:13	forth 33:21	gender 30:2	33:14 35:9,14	guy's 7:4
Finance 29:20	forward 23:18	general 32:17	38:10 39:7	
financial 3:13	33:20	gentleman 36:10	40:10,14 42:9	H H
4:13	fostering 35:11	39:18	42:17 43:8	Haidt's 16:7
financially 44:8	founded 11:16	Georgetown 20:1	good 5:14 16:20	half 6:11,11

38:11,11	hostile 35:4	30:22	instantly 23:16	IX 13:24 29:2,5
hallows 17:16	hour 36:14	inaudible 32:11	institution 8:14	1A 13.24 27.2,3
hammered 37:19	How'd 35:25	32:14 39:24	8:16 9:18 30:2	J
hand 37:5 39:19	huge 4:9 11:21	40:2,18	30:9	jazz 15:11
handbook 21:22	16:6 32:7	incentive 19:22	institutional	Jerry 8:8,8 12:15
28:12 42:7 43:4	hundred 25:7	21:9 22:21,22	10:24 11:22	job 21:2,7 30:10
hang 4:18	hurt 37:18	22:22 23:25	20:14	30:12 31:9
happen 13:1	Huit 37.16	incentives 4:1	institutions 10:18	39:10
42:13 43:8	I	19:20,21 20:23	10:18,22 11:15	jobs 31:21
happened 7:8	i- 39:1	21:3,8 22:14,20	13:3 39:13	John 2:2,15
11:23	idea 3:7 13:13,25	23:21 24:2,21	insulting 18:15	41:23 42:1,2
happening 7:21	15:10 26:19	41:10,19	intellectually	John's 3:7
happens 4:14	34:15 36:15	incentivized 24:1	15:24	join 16:11 43:12
37:4 42:3	38:23 39:1	incentivizing	intentionally	Jonathan 16:6
happy 8:25	ideal- 23:24	20:18	17:18	29:15,20,20
harbor 21:13	ideali- 21:5	incidents 20:12	interested 11:9	Joshua 17:6
25:17	idealized 21:6,7	inclination 28:24	11:11 27:21,23	jump 38:22
hard 4:11 10:23	idealogical 23:24	including 28:9	44:9	justice 28:20
11:8 15:2,2	ideas 6:7 13:16	inclusion 20:6,15	internal 34:25	
30:6	14:10 16:5	incredibly 15:10	41:9	K
Harvard 5:9	18:11,18 23:17	independence	introduce 27:4	Kalven 8:9,13
37:18	identified 34:6,7	4:10	27:11,13 29:18	11:19 12:5
Hasnus 28:13	ignored 24:15	independent 7:3	investigate 20:12	13:21
hate 31:9	illegal 31:14,23	indi- 35:19	22:19	Kats 17:6
hawing 31:5	32:10	indication 25:3	investigating	Kaufmann 34:18
head 9:14 33:13	illegally 29:4	individual 21:15	20:18	34:19
hear 16:6 27:12	31:25	21:17 25:20	investigation	keep 21:2,8 27:4
34:18	immediate 8:22	42:10,12	22:12,13 23:8	keeping 8:20
heard 42:15	immediately 10:5	individuals 28:16	investigations	key 37:15,23
hearing 44:8	28:14 31:8	35:20 36:4	34:25	kids 16:1
Hello 34:18	implemented	inf- 8:21	involved 12:16	kind 3:13 4:3
help 37:24	24:13	inferences 2:22	13:18 34:23	7:22 8:4 12:14
hemming 31:5	implications 8:22	inform 20:19	35:8,19 36:2	13:24 14:12
Heterodox 13:7	38:4	information 14:5	involves 17:4	23:8 24:24
high-power 3:25	importance	20:13 33:20,23	involving 10:19	28:12 32:4
higher 27:21	42:19	34:8,13	IQ 5:16	kinds 31:20
hire 5:13	important 5:25	informed 3:13	irregard- 36:18	33:24 KKK 15:11
hiring 8:21 9:7	8:21 9:15 17:3	initial 23:4,5,8	issue 2:23 8:15	KKK 15:11 know 2:18,19
hog 34:21	17:22 18:1	insane 4:23 10:10	12:19 16:4 23:8	3:22,25 4:1,9
holdout 25:2	21:22 22:22	insensitive 20:17	23:25 34:7	4:10,13,14 5:2
home 34:22	32:20 36:19	inside 33:9,9,23	38:20	5:13,18 6:2,9
hood 39:5	37:3 42:5	insider 14:5	issues 11:4,20	6:19,23 7:8,10
hoods 15:12	imposing 28:9	33:20	12:6 17:14	7:24 8:25 9:9
hope 24:1,12	improve 9:19	instance- 19:24	38:16	9:22 10:12,23
hoping 24:5	improvements	instances 19:25	it'll 26:25	7.22 10.12,23
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	l			
11:2,5,9,11,24	18:23 23:11	listened 6:3	2:17 24:11 25:9	microphone 27:7
13:1 14:11,11	26:8 30:17,19	36:13	25:12,15,23	million 9:23
14:22,25 15:11	30:25 32:6	listserv 11:20	26:2,5,18,24	minds 32:1
15:13,20,24	41:16	literally 40:13	34:1,5 38:22	minorities 31:21
16:1,6,7,14,15	lax 19:16	literary 21:18	lying 34:8	miserable 4:7
16:20 17:2,4	le- 33:8	litigation 39:23		missing 42:5
20:11 23:10,15	leaders 12:15	41:15		MIT 9:13 32:13
24:17,20,25	learn 19:20	little 2:12 5:16	magic 41:18	32:13,18,21
25:2 26:24	learned 15:19	9:1 13:6 14:15	majority 9:6 10:2	mockery 16:19
27:18 28:22	learning 15:21	39:12	making 23:14	model 28:4
31:15,19 33:6	leave 26:12	live 2:18	25:24 35:25	moderate 40:21
33:14 34:8	leaves 33:22	lives 4:7	36:5	MODERATOR
35:24 37:16,19	leg- 36:1	location 23:20	managing 4:25	2:2 8:2 17:10
38:16,19 40:4	legal 22:5 23:10	locus 23:2	market 3:16	24:4 25:5 27:2
41:10 42:9,18	26:10	logic 16:2,4	married 40:3	27:7,11,13
43:1,7,8	legality 31:17	London 34:19	massive 40:24	28:25 29:15,18
kowtow 10:12	legally 21:23,24	long 10:6 36:13	materials 31:16	34:16 35:15
	22:2	42:15	matter 4:20 9:24	39:15,18 41:20
	legislation 34:23	longer 42:8	44:5	41:22 43:12
lack 19:25	35:21 39:23	look 5:17 7:15	McKenna 33:17	mollify 41:11
lake 25:12	legislative 35:3	10:10 11:15	mean 6:2 7:17	moment 6:24
language 17:17	legislators 27:20	19:3,20 32:8	16:12 24:15	money 4:5,15 6:7
19:5	27:22 28:3,4	34:13 38:15	26:18 30:18,18	10:1 24:16,16
large 40:18,20	Leo 36:11	39:4,8,8	33:1 34:24	24:17 30:17,20
larger 17:14	Leonard 36:11	looking 14:21	38:22 42:25	40:10,14
launched 9:22	let's 22:11 41:18	15:8 39:5	means 4:12 25:16	moral 37:24
law 19:18 27:16	letters 30:18	looks 4:20 7:24	30:7 33:6,7	morning 2:2 8:8
30:1,13 32:19	level 26:1	11:15	measures 28:21	Morris 7:11,15
32:23 33:1	leverage 28:8	loses 4:15	media 20:11	7:16
34:24 35:9,14	liability 35:21	loss 27:24	meetings 11:12	motivated 36:3
law- 41:2	libel 18:15	lot 2:19,19,24 4:3	12:17	41:9
laws 35:7	liberal 43:6	4:10,16 7:13	megaphone 42:1	move 6:12
lawsuit 14:7	libertarian 10:21	9:22 10:20 11:7	member 36:20	mu- 4:24
21:25 25:22	libertarians	11:23 12:16	members 8:16	musician 15:11
26:14 29:23	27:19	14:11 15:5 16:3	11:17 16:10	
30:25 31:7,10	life 37:6	19:21 25:2	35:24	N
31:15 32:3,3	limited 17:13,25	28:21 30:19	memory 11:22	Nadon 33:15,15
40:12	Linc- 37:5	37:18 38:2,20	mention 29:1	name 33:15
lawsuits 14:2	Lincoln 37:4,6	40:4	38:14	36:11 41:23
22:10,16,17	Lincoln's 37:5	lots 28:4	mentioned 13:4	names 11:18
26:6,21 30:19	line 31:18,25	loud 18:16	merit 9:8	23:24
31:11 40:2,18	38:23	love 5:19 15:19	message 31:25	narrow 17:12
41:3	lines 7:7	16:17	messages 20:10	National 36:9
lawyer 36:6	list 20:2 30:3	low 40:5	20:13	necessarily 11:10
lawyers 14:2,11	listen 5:10	LOWERY 1:10	mic 34:16	13:16
L				

necessary 2:15	offensive 18:18	particular 11:21	31:6 33:22	population 10:25
need 3:6,8,9,14	20:17	14:23 15:9	person's 40:22	position 8:15
4:11,17,22,25	offer 18:3	21:11 22:18	personal 33:18	36:1
7:4 14:18 15:13	Office 20:14	36:25 37:2	personnel 39:8	positioning 4:13
15:14 16:21	official 8:14	42:21	persuade 32:16	positive 35:11
36:24 38:13	officials 28:17	particularly 29:6	32:22	positive 33.11 possibility 33:19
39:10,13 40:24	oh 8:24 9:9 27:6	parties 44:7	persuasion 36:19	possible 23:1
41:13,13	27:15 29:19,19	parties 44.7 partisan 27:10	pes- 24:8	40:19
needed 6:25	39:2 40:9 42:20	27:17	pessimistic 24:9	possibly 23:1
neither 44:6	okay 8:3,23 9:4	party 41:9	Peter 2:13	posted 20:10
network 22:5	10:16 15:3	path 14:15	Philip 7:11,15,15	potential 13:16
26:7	17:11 25:14	pay 24:2 40:14	philosophers	24:9 27:17
networks 9:17	27:8 38:10	Pennsylvania	42:4	36:23
11:25	41:11	27:16	philosophical	power 10:24
Neuss 9:15 36:8,8	once 37:7	people 3:21 5:9	21:18	24:14 28:23
neutral 12:6	ones 3:23	5:10,16,20,23	philosophy 41:24	42:23,23
never 4:23 5:22	open 17:11 27:3	5:24 7:9,10,18	phonetic 28:13	practical 2:5 8:1
8:14 31:9 42:3	33:23	7:20,21 9:6,14	physics 29:7	12:1 18:3 21:10
new 6:15 10:18	opening 2:3,11	9:17,22,24 10:7	picks 36:14	24:7 32:12
12:17 13:3	operating 14:16	10:10,23 11:3	pile 4:16	33:18,18 38:14
20:11	operation 37:23	12:2 13:8 14:11	pin 9:12	precedent 35:5
newsletters 20:5	opinion 38:25	14:22 15:7,11	place 6:15 8:12	premise 31:13
nicotine 7:18	opportunities	15:18,19 16:5,8	9:11 29:23 40:1	preserving 14:20
nitty-gritty 32:23	30:8	16:13,21,22,24	40:1 41:1	president 10:14
nobody's 40:13	optimistic 11:2	17:5,8 18:17	places 4:20	12:17,18,22
nondisclosure	order 2:10 12:20	19:17,23 20:16	plans 2:18 8:7	42:24
34:10	organizations	20:19,24 21:4,5	10:16,17	presidents 10:11
nonsense 30:19	22:5	22:7,9,19 23:9	players 37:21	19:14,15
North 44:17	orthodoxy 7:4	23:15,24,25	please 2:16 27:4	pressing 29:9
Notre 38:5	other's 17:3	24:25,25 25:19	27:11,14 43:12	pressure 35:23
number 9:4	outcome 44:9	25:25 26:9,12	plenty 15:18	prestige 6:1,2
nut 35:8	outreach 31:20	30:7 32:1 34:14	point 24:20 29:17	40:11
	oversee 28:19	35:22 37:8	34:22 42:7 43:5	prestigious 30:11
0	owner 37:4	38:11,11 39:8,9	pointing 36:25	pretty 30:10,11
O- 25:14	P	39:13 41:10	policies 19:12,14	preventing 22:17
objective 8:6,9	-	42:5,19	36:5 41:1	31:11 41:3
obstinate 11:6	paid 14:8 44:11	people's 8:13	policy 19:3 21:12	principle 8:9
obvious 31:13	paid/will 44:11	peoples' 4:7	21:14,16,21	21:9
obviously 24:6 26:16 38:23	pandemic 7:1	percent 11:3,5	23:19 26:20,20	principles 8:11
	panel 2:8 6:15 14:13 18:3	12:23 28:2	26:21 35:2	8:24 11:19
occupationally 19:20	panelists 24:8	percentage 10:25	political 8:15	13:21,23 18:22
occurred 30:20	43:13	perfectly 27:20	12:6,11 21:19	18:22 19:3 25:7
offending 12:19	part 15:15 17:1	38:10	34:20 36:18,22	26:17 28:11
offends 8:12	38:6,14	person 6:3 22:23	politically 36:3	32:15 33:6
offenus 0.12	30.0,14	26:18 30:23,24	politicians 36:2	private 2:22,24
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	-			-
3:1,1,4,5,9,16	providing 5:8	31:4,13 32:12	15:13,20 16:4	36:8
3:18,20 8:1	41:16	33:17 35:15	16:18 17:2,6	Republican 28:3
18:20 25:4 28:5	provision 22:18	39:22	29:24 34:22	Republicans
28:16	provisions 25:17	questions 27:5	37:15 38:8,13	27:23
pro 22:5 26:8	35:10	39:16	39:4 42:22	reputation 7:19
probably 3:5	provocative	quick 6:4 34:21	reason 7:18	Require 28:17
15:1	10:20 13:13	41:21	15:15 31:5	requirements
problem 3:8 18:5	provost 12:9,21	quite 16:7 24:6	receive 28:6	28:9
19:7,8,18,21	41:25	33:25	receptive 29:6	requires 16:14
20:22 21:2	provost's 22:21		recording 2:1	research 11:10
26:11 33:22	provosts 19:13	R	43:14 44:4	15:17 19:23,24
34:7,11 36:2	19:15	R 44:1	redeemable 15:7	resources 4:17
41:15 43:5,5	public 2:19,20,25	race 28:8 29:4	reference 35:3	respected 12:7,8
problems 4:10,24	9:5,10 18:6	30:2	reform 2:20 5:2	respond 21:3,7
proceedings 44:4	28:6	races 9:6	27:21	39:2
process 5:12 6:9	publicly 11:18	racial 32:1 38:16	refunded 14:9	restrain 19:12
12:18 22:6	publish 31:16	racially-insensi	regard 18:4	restrictions
33:16	published 17:15	20:10	regardless 36:22	18:23
processes 37:19	punish 41:11	racist 16:11	Registration	results 13:15
produce 40:18,20	punished 18:12	raise 5:21 9:25	44:17	return 22:9
product 3:15,15	18:19 41:2	random 6:18	regulatable	reveal 34:9
5:6 6:5,18	punishment	randomized	18:17	reversed 7:2
productive 6:22	22:13 40:12,16	38:10	related 44:6	review 23:5,5,8
professor 27:15	punishments	Randy 37:3	relationship	rewarded 20:24
28:22 29:20	8:13	rate 12:23	16:13,21,23	rhetoric 16:3
31:1 41:24	punitive 40:5,18	rational 10:14	relationships	Richard 2:11,16
professor's 40:23	40:20,24	re- 8:17	15:17 35:11	24:5 42:20
professors 32:22	purpose 19:11	reach 24:24	relevant 20:9	Richard's 36:15
programs 29:3	pursued 23:7	react 41:20	religious 21:18	Rick 11:21,22
progress 38:2	push 27:19 43:3	reaction 17:23	reluctant 27:19	ride 4:11
progressiveism	pushing 38:13,15	24:6,10 28:25	remarks 2:3,11	right 3:25 9:24
28:1	put 5:25 7:13,20	reactions 27:2	17:12	14:14 16:12,14
project 6:7	8:12 11:18	35:15	remember 27:4	18:4 19:11,16
projects 13:5	12:20 13:9	read 17:7 20:4	removed 12:14	20:22 21:6 25:9
prophylactive	16:16 19:17	38:7 42:6	29:11	25:11,23 26:18
23:3	29:22 31:24	real 22:2 28:4	repeatedly 12:10	27:3 29:23 30:5
propose 13:15	32:18 33:13	31:5 34:7,7	replace 39:11	30:9,17,19,23
25:17	putting 12:10	realistic 23:23	replaced 24:16	32:5,10,25 33:3
protect 2:6	33:25	reality 15:21	report 8:9,10,14	34:17 36:17
protected 18:13	O	really 3:8,15,17	8:17,19 11:19	37:17 39:9,15
18:17		3:21 4:11 6:6	12:5 13:21,22	39:17 40:11
protects 18:19	Q&A 27:3,3	6:23,24 7:4,13	20:14	41:22 42:25
proud 36:10,21	qualifications 8:19	7:20,21 8:21	Reporter 44:2,16	43:9,11,12
prove 14:2,6 30:6		9:15,18,23,24 10:23,25 15:2	represent 22:7	rights 35:9,20,24
provides 33:22	question 29:24	10.25,25 15.2	representing	36:4,6 39:25

40:7	scientific 11:9	showing 7:14,21	sophomore 38:5	sprung 9:17
rise 5:24	21:19	12:4	sorry 6:23 29:19	squash 37:20,21
risk 8:15 24:22	scientists 6:10	Shweder 11:22	31:4 35:16	stage 2:12
Robin 38:7,9,12	scope 13:5	sic 10:4	39:23	stand 6:25
role 35:17,17	scrupulously	side 2:14 8:7 10:3	sort 2:5,11,24	stand 0.23
room 15:1	31:17	11:14 16:15	4:25 5:7,20 6:7	Stanford 5:7,10
ROSE 17:11 25:6	second 9:12	24:18,18 36:22	8:4 10:12 11:1	32:6 36:20,20
25:11,14,16,24	10:18 13:25	39:23,24	12:9 13:5,9	start 3:8 4:18
26:4,7,23 31:12	17:22 18:1	signaling 4:4	14:1,5,10,17,17	12:4 22:23
32:10,24 34:6	see 4:16 5:14	signed 13:8	24:8 25:2 27:8	started 2:16 10:4
34:15 35:16	17:5 24:12 25:1	significant 40:23	35:9 38:25	12:22
40:17 42:3	25:2 35:8 37:16	signing 42:15	sorts 11:25 29:12	starting 10:18
43:10	40:15 42:18	silent 10:2,3	space 14:16	13:3
roundabout	seeing 15:6	simply 23:23	speak 2:14 17:9,9	state 2:4 29:25
38:19	selection 5:15,16	sit 40:8	17:18	30:1,13 32:19
route 40:15	31:22	sitting 9:16 11:11	speaker 18:16	34:12 44:3
rules 2:13 22:24	self-enforcing	11:12	27:6 32:11	statement 12:19
28:7,12,12,20	25:18,20,25	situation 9:20	34:17 39:17	12:20,24 20:8
35:25	selling 6:1,18	skirt 31:17	41:21	42:16
run 24:22 43:2	7:16,19	slap 40:6,13	speaking 18:16	statements 8:20
running 7:23	senate 10:6 12:3	Slight 2:17	34:20	12:10,14,23
runs 3:18 42:22	43:10	small 10:25 37:8	specific 30:24	19:4 20:21 32:9
	sending 17:4	smoking 32:4	36:5	32:17 42:16
S	34:14	so- 23:1	specified 35:13	states 21:23,24
safe 3:3 21:13	sense 18:9,10	social 8:15 12:6	specifying 35:5	status 30:22
25:17	23:3	12:11 17:24	spectrum 36:22	statute 33:25
Salem 39:21	sensible 5:22	20:11	speech 8:13,16	STEM 13:7
salvaging 39:6	sentence 21:13	socially 3:2	9:13,16 17:13	step 4:8 21:14
sanction 17:24 sanctioned 17:21	42:6,12	Society 36:12	18:4,7,10,12,13	22:3,4,25
sanctioned 17:21 sane 10:14	serious 34:11	soft 15:24	18:14 19:6,7,12	step-by-step
sane 10.14 sanity 10:9	serving 34:9	solely 21:17	19:14 20:7	41:17
samty 10.9 saying 20:19	set 12:9,18 16:22	23:17	21:12,14,21	sticking 16:15
22:23 32:20	39:9	solution 7:6,7 8:1	22:1,7,10,19	stipulations
33:7	setting 2:11 seven 20:2 29:11	20:23,23 23:1	23:6,10,15,18 25:20 26:9	29:13
says 8:14,17 28:5	sex 28:8 29:4	38:14 solutions 1:11	28:14,19 32:13	stories 24:23 straight 7:3
scholarly 11:10	sex 28.8 29.4 shared 11:22	2:6,9 8:5 18:3	32:21 35:1,12	straight 7.3 strange 3:17
school 16:1,2	sharing 2:12	21:10 24:7	36:9,10 41:2,11	strategies 24:10
19:19,19 21:2,8	sharing 2.12 sharks 31:1	38:17	speeches 11:23	24:12
26:11 27:16	Shils 8:10,17,19	solve 38:16	speed 32:25	strategy 37:12
29:21 31:21	13:22	solve 36.16 solving 41:15	spent 32:24 39:4	42:15 43:9
schools 25:4,7	Shorthand 44:2	somebody 20:11	spoke 9:13	streaming 2:18
26:16	44:16	22:11 41:2,7	spoke 3.13 spoken 14:23,25	strength 9:5,11
science 6:5,7,12	shot 41:4	somewhat 19:16	spot 6:16	9:20 10:13,15
6:14 34:20	show 12:3 38:1	son's 38:5	spotlight 37:8,11	strengthening
	-	-	-	*

20.6	arra on 0.6	38:24	6.6.17.7.6.6.25	40
20:6	super 9:6		6:6,17 7:6,6,25	tomorrow 41:18
strengths 8:7 9:4	super-central	tarnishment	9:5,7,8,9,20	ton 15:19,21
strikes 5:3	14:20	36:15	10:2,11,15,19	tone 12:9
stronger 29:25	support 9:5	taxing 6:9	11:13 12:11	top 5:21,24 26:1
structure 3:15	11:19	teach 19:18,19	13:10 14:17,19	total 27:24
4:12,20,23,23	supposed 12:6,10	team 37:20	14:23 15:1,2,3	totally 39:12,13
5:2 6:6,20	suppressed 22:8	tell 5:7	15:9,15,24 16:3	toxic 38:9
23:25	26:10	telling 24:23	16:6,17,20	trained 5:17
structures 41:9	suppressing 8:16	tells 31:24	17:11 18:1,21	training 5:14
struggle 23:25	Supreme 37:17	ten 11:5	19:11 24:11,22	22:24
student 14:8 29:7	sure 4:22 9:2	tend 43:6	26:20,25 27:17	transcription
students 10:2	36:17 39:20,24	tens 4:21	28:4,18 29:14	44:4,10
13:8 17:23 21:1	40:9	terms 2:10 13:3	29:17,21 30:5,9	transparency
35:24 37:25	surprising 19:16	37:12	30:16 31:3,10	37:15,23
41:11	survive 15:16	Terri 44:2,15	34:22 35:13	transparency's
study 35:2	switched 2:18	terrible 4:18 5:23	37:14,22,22,23	37:14
stuff 9:5 12:11	symbolizes 15:10	Texas 31:2 39:22	38:1,9,13,18,20	transparent
13:1,6 14:12	sympathetic	44:3,15,18	38:24 39:1,14	38:15
38:11 39:5	26:25	Thank 8:2 17:10	39:15 42:5,14	treatment 7:8
stupid 11:11		24:4	42:16,18 43:8	trenches 8:4
subject 4:25	T	thanking 43:13	thinking 5:4 13:9	trends 28:2
22:11	T 44:1,1	they'd 7:2	thinks 9:10	Trifecta 13:21
subjected 35:22	ta- 12:22	thing 5:23 8:23	third 10:19	trouble 10:5
submissions 13:7	table 39:19	10:9 12:4 13:24	thought 2:24 7:3	true 5:15 15:1
submit 12:19	take 8:14 10:24	14:3 20:19 29:2	threat 26:13	30:7 32:6,7
Substack 13:6,7	13:14 14:15	30:11 32:12	three 3:6,11,14	trump 35:12
success 24:9	26:8 27:18	35:18,25 37:15	10:16,17 12:17	try 9:19 13:11
36:25	33:10 40:1,1,1	38:8,10 41:17	14:18,19	18:2
sucks 16:12,12	taken 12:23,24	42:5	three-quarters	trying 2:4 9:2
sudden 12:7	44:8	things 3:6,11,14	9:9	25:25 27:21
sue 25:21 28:16	takes 33:5 35:5	4:1 5:9,18,25	threw 37:8,10	32:16 36:12
36:6 39:24	talk 2:20,21,21	6:11 7:10,23	throw 35:1	37:13
40:10 41:7	8:4,6 9:1 10:16	9:2,25 10:7,24	tie 13:22 14:4	tuition 14:8,9
42:12	13:19 14:15	11:23 12:1,3	time 10:8,11	tuned 35:13
sued 22:18	15:11 18:1,2	13:14 14:23,24	14:13 17:25	turn 15:12 27:6
suggestion 23:22	34:4,24 40:4,11	15:6 16:16 17:3	20:4,5 34:21	37:13
24:6 29:23	talk- 38:20	17:13 18:16	35:7 39:16 40:1	turned 7:9
suggestions	talked 13:20	24:2,23 25:3,19	40:10 41:1,12	turns 16:18
29:22	33:19	26:15 29:7	42:15	Twitter 9:22,25
suing 26:19 31:2	talking 2:13 3:16	31:20,25 37:13	times 16:3 17:5	two 5:3 12:25
suit 41:13 42:8	26:2 28:13 41:6	37:16,18,22	Title 13:24 28:5,5	13:16 14:10
42:10,10	tarnish 36:24	39:3,3	28:9 29:2,2,5	17:20 21:10
Suite 44:18	39:2,10	think 2:5,8 3:3,6	tobacco 7:7,9	30:21 32:24,25
summarily 21:15	tarnished 36:22	3:11,24,25 5:4	told 5:23	33:10 36:14
summarize 14:17	tarnishing 37:1,2	5:5,23,24 6:4,6	tolerate 28:19	39:16

		1,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	1 42.0	2004145
two-year 12:14	6:24 8:20 9:7	VI 28:5,5,9 29:2	43:9	38:9 41:17
types 3:25 10:17	9:21 10:6 12:2	viewpoints 21:19	Wayne 37:3	working 2:23
10:21 17:3,20	12:5 13:4 14:3	views 14:16	ways 13:17 16:5	10:17,22 11:15
37:22	14:6 17:21 18:6	15:16	we'll 2:10 3:4	17:13 33:12
typically 40:19	18:25 19:12	vindicate 35:23	14:18 27:3 33:4	works 13:12 22:4
U	20:1,18,21	violate 22:18	39:2	38:18
	21:14,16,23	23:19	we're 3:16 5:1	world 32:21
u- 10:11	22:15,15,16,21	violated 21:16	6:13,18 8:25	worry 32:7 42:8
UChicago 9:3	25:21 26:15	30:13 36:7	11:9,10,13	worse 7:25 33:10
11:16,17 29:2	27:16 28:2,10	violates 42:11	12:10 14:16,20	worst 6:15
un- 37:12	28:11,17 29:10	violating 35:6	15:8 16:4 20:7	worth 3:12 15:3
undealt 37:12	30:1,10,14	40:6	23:24 31:19,20	26:13 39:5
undermine 27:25	31:16,24 32:8	violation 12:24	35:14 36:1,10	wouldn't 7:22
understand 2:4	33:9 34:8,19	33:24 39:25	37:20 38:3,10	33:13 40:18,20
3:9,14 23:9,12	35:23 37:10	violations 23:6	39:7	wrist 40:6,13
27:19 29:24	39:22 40:5 41:2	28:19	we've 8:24 9:1	write 21:11,20
understanding	41:5,8 42:11,22	virtue 4:4	12:1,4,22,24	25:10 28:11
40:3	43:2	voluntarily 18:25	20:2,7 24:22	writing 12:16
understood 3:6	university's	25:8 26:22	34:23 36:25	written 18:23
unfamiliar 35:17	19:13 21:21	vote 10:7	39:12,13	31:17 35:10
unfettered 19:5	26:15 30:14	vs 1:10	website 11:18	wrong 19:17
Uni- 21:14	unnoticed 37:11		went 7:3 12:13	20:19 33:3
UNIDENTIFI	unpopular 9:6	W	29:10	37:24 39:12,13
27:6 32:11	untrammeled	want 2:22 8:5,6	widespread 22:5	41:7
34:17 39:17	19:4	9:19 10:1 16:23	willing 11:4,6,8	wrongdoing
41:21	update 20:6	23:14,22 24:1	11:18	33:21
univer- 3:1 39:7	uphold 21:9	24:24 25:10	wimped 14:25	wronged 42:12
univers- 29:5	upholding 20:24	28:6 29:16,16	win 10:7 12:3	
universities 2:7	urge 20:13	34:20,21 35:18	31:15 32:3	X
2:19,20,25,25	use 19:6 35:9	35:19,22,25	winning 22:16	T 7
3:1,4,5,10,17	37:24	36:1,3,21 38:15	41:3	<u>Y</u>
3:20,22 4:2,13	useful 3:2 8:5	38:16 41:8,20	woke 4:3 9:5	yeah 25:6 27:9,13
5:6,21 6:4,14	11:21,25 13:2	41:25	10:10,23 36:16	29:1 30:21
6:25 7:14,19	13:10 29:13	wanted 3:24 27:9	wokeism 27:25	33:15 34:18
8:1 9:10 10:12	useless 6:21	wants 24:14 25:5	women 29:8	35:16 40:10,12
18:6,9,20,21,24	uses 6:11	warned 16:10	wonder 36:23	41:22
10.0,7,20,21,24	uses 0.11	,, arrica 10.10	WOHUCI 50.25	
19:2,7,25 22:10		wasting 20:4	wonderful 42:17	year 14:8 29:3,9
	usually 17:23		wonderful 42:17	38:6
19:2,7,25 22:10	usually 17:23 23:25	wasting 20:4	wonderful 42:17 words 19:4 33:1	38:6 years 12:25 20:2
19:2,7,25 22:10 22:17 25:21	usually 17:23 23:25 UT 1:10	wasting 20:4 Wax 27:9,12,15	wonderful 42:17	38:6 years 12:25 20:2 31:23 32:24,25
19:2,7,25 22:10 22:17 25:21 26:19 28:5	usually 17:23 23:25	wasting 20:4 Wax 27:9,12,15 27:15	wonderful 42:17 words 19:4 33:1 36:14	38:6 years 12:25 20:2
19:2,7,25 22:10 22:17 25:21 26:19 28:5 31:14 32:19	usually 17:23 23:25 UT 1:10	wasting 20:4 Wax 27:9,12,15 27:15 way 4:25 5:17	wonderful 42:17 words 19:4 33:1 36:14 wore 9:12 work 4:11 7:11	38:6 years 12:25 20:2 31:23 32:24,25 33:11 39:5,9
19:2,7,25 22:10 22:17 25:21 26:19 28:5 31:14 32:19 34:12 37:24	usually 17:23 23:25 UT 1:10 V	wasting 20:4 Wax 27:9,12,15 27:15 way 4:25 5:17 13:23,25 15:3	wonderful 42:17 words 19:4 33:1 36:14 wore 9:12 work 4:11 7:11 9:19 10:23 11:8	38:6 years 12:25 20:2 31:23 32:24,25 33:11 39:5,9 Z
19:2,7,25 22:10 22:17 25:21 26:19 28:5 31:14 32:19 34:12 37:24 38:1,15 39:24	usually 17:23 23:25 UT 1:10 V valuable 6:5	wasting 20:4 Wax 27:9,12,15 27:15 way 4:25 5:17 13:23,25 15:3 19:23 23:20	wonderful 42:17 words 19:4 33:1 36:14 wore 9:12 work 4:11 7:11 9:19 10:23 11:8 13:12 16:25	38:6 years 12:25 20:2 31:23 32:24,25 33:11 39:5,9 Z zero 4:9
19:2,7,25 22:10 22:17 25:21 26:19 28:5 31:14 32:19 34:12 37:24 38:1,15 39:24 40:16 41:1	usually 17:23 23:25 UT 1:10 V valuable 6:5 various 33:24	wasting 20:4 Wax 27:9,12,15 27:15 way 4:25 5:17 13:23,25 15:3 19:23 23:20 24:17 25:24	wonderful 42:17 words 19:4 33:1 36:14 wore 9:12 work 4:11 7:11 9:19 10:23 11:8 13:12 16:25 19:23 20:1 24:2	38:6 years 12:25 20:2 31:23 32:24,25 33:11 39:5,9 Z
19:2,7,25 22:10 22:17 25:21 26:19 28:5 31:14 32:19 34:12 37:24 38:1,15 39:24 40:16 41:1 university 3:18	usually 17:23 23:25 UT 1:10 V valuable 6:5 various 33:24 vast 9:6	wasting 20:4 Wax 27:9,12,15 27:15 way 4:25 5:17 13:23,25 15:3 19:23 23:20 24:17 25:24 33:7 38:19	wonderful 42:17 words 19:4 33:1 36:14 wore 9:12 work 4:11 7:11 9:19 10:23 11:8 13:12 16:25	38:6 years 12:25 20:2 31:23 32:24,25 33:11 39:5,9 Z zero 4:9

214.855.5100

0			
1			
1 22:3,25			
10,000 41:4			
100 12:23 18:21			
28:2			
101 44:18			
150 9:23			
2			
2 22:4			
2010 35:10			
2015 33:11			
2013 33:11 2017 33:11			
2020 12:7			
214 44:19			
3			
30 39:9			
312 44:17			
4			
4			
40 39:9			
4228 44:17			
5			
50 11:17			
30 11.17			
6			
6581 44:16			
7			
7-31-23 44:19			
75206 44:18			
13400 44.10			
8			
-			
855-5100 44:19			
9			
90 11:3			